

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to support the amendment, and I say that on the basis that I intend to support the bill. I also voted to return on the motion previously, because I had made a commitment, mine was a little bit different. I also was willing to add the money, however, to pay for it, not to take it out. And I would have, had the bill been returned for that previous amendment, would have not supported it, unless I felt comfortable that the additional costs would have been put into the bill. But this one we talked on the other day when we tried to take the sunset out of LB 611. What you have is one state aid formula left. Now I can appreciate a great deal the rationale that Senator Withem just announced, that to return the bill for something perhaps subjects it to something else, I understand that. But I think there is an overriding issue, because if you have one formula abolished, as was done in LB 611, which I think is wrong, but if you have one, and that was supposed to be a threat, you better do them all, or else we should return LB 611 and get the foundation and equalization repealer out of that. Actually, I don't care which way you go, but you can't logically do one and not the other. They ought to be treated the same because they both are substantive distribution formulas that can be used irregardless of the amount of money that is available. And I think it makes sense in the long run if the theory is, as I heard it expressed on the floor on 611, that you are going to create a problem in order to solve an issue, which will backfire nine times out of ten, or maybe 99 out of 100. But if that is the theory then you better not have an escape clause for everybody to run to. It's just that simple. Either you make it tough, or you have nothing on the theory that you're going to create a crisis to solve a problem. So I think the amendment is right, that the two are treated the same. That's the only issue with me. I intend to vote for the bill, irregardless of whether it's adopted or not. But those of you who think you are creating a crisis with the repealer in 611 are not creating a crisis at all, you're just putting all the emphasis on one distribution formula, which I may like, I don't know. I may like all the money distributed that way. I indicated that last time we had it up in terms of my district. But the theory of crisis to solve a problem, unless you have all distribution formulas on the same level, that theory, in fact, does not exist. I would hope that this amendment could be considered notwithstanding the jeopardy that some may feel exist to having a bill amended in any fashion.